

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

April 27, 2000

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman David Williams called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman David Williams; Board Members Walter Lemon III, Monty Edberg, Renee Cannon, Anissa Crane and Hal Beighley. Board Member Stewart Straus was excused.

Senior Planner John Osterberg and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

VISITORS:

Chairman Williams read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairman Williams opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the meeting. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

Mr. Bailey reported that while he has been a consultant for the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District for other park projects, this would not affect any decision he makes tonight on BDR 2000-0019 – Skyview Park.

A. BDR 2000 0025 – CORNELL PHASE IV OFFICE/WAREHOUSE BUILDING TYPE III DESIGN REVIEW

This land use application has been submitted for a 28,300 square foot office and warehouse building. The proposal includes a new building, parking, stormwater

swale, and associated landscaping. The development proposal is located on Assessor's Map 1N1-31AD, Tax Lot 1100, and is zoned Campus Industrial (CI).

Senior Planner John Osterberg presented the staff report and noted that the applicant has requested a continuance until June 22, 2000.

Mr. Lemon **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion that BDR 2000-0025 – Cornell Phase IV Office/Warehouse Building Type III Design Review was continued to a date certain of June 22, 2000.

Motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

B. BDR 99-00231/VAR 99-00030/VAR 99-00031 – HOME DEPOT TYPE III DESIGN REVIEW AND DESIGN VARIANCES

These land use applications have been submitted for approximately 109,300 square foot commercial building and a 14,700 square foot garden center on approximately 7.23 acres of land located at 5150 SW Western Avenue. The request for Design Review approval of this proposed commercial project includes a new building, parking structure, sidewalks and associated landscaping. The first request for Design Variance approval is to allow a reduction in the required landscape area. The applicant proposes approximately 7% of landscaped area, which is less than the required 15% of the total site area required. The second request for Design Variance approval is to allow a 2-foot reduction in the side yard setback from the standard 10-feet to 8-feet, along SW 5th Street. The development proposal is located on Assessor's Map 1S1-14CB on Tax Lots 1000 and 1100, and is zoned Campus Industrial (CI) within a Development Control Area (DCA) overlay district. Both applications will be reviewed in accordance with the criteria for approval and Development Code standards in effect on the date of application.

Mr. Osterberg presented the staff reports and reported that the applicant has requested that this Public Hearing be continued until July 22, 2000.

Mr. Lemon **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion that BDR 99-00231/VAR 99-00030/VAR 99-00031 Home Depot Type III Design Review/Design Variance was continued to a date certain of July 22, 2000.

Motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

C. BDR 2000-0019 – TUALATIN HILLS PARK AND RECREATION SKYVIEW PARK TYPE III DESIGN REVIEW

The request for Design Review approval to develop a public park on NW Bronson Road includes a play structure, walkways, a swing set, a picnic table, game table and benches, a drinking fountain, a bike rack, landscaping and irrigation on a parcel .81 acres in size. The parcel is on Assessor's Map 1N1-29 at Tax Lot 2400 and has been annexed into the City of Beaverton. Although this parcel is

currently being rezoned, the interim zoning of the parcel is Washington County's R-5 designation.

Observing that he is sitting in for Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson, Mr. Osterberg presented the staff report and described the project, referring to it as a site plan for a fairly straightforward request. He observed that this is being reviewed in accordance with County zoning requirements, adding that it had been received prior to the adoption of any city standards regarding such an application. He mentioned that the fourteen recommended conditions of approval are fairly standard, adding that staff is recommending approval.

APPLICANT:

DAWN HARTMAN, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, OR 97006, representing the Tualatin Parks and Recreation District, presented the plan for Skyview Park, provided illustrations and described the project.

On question, Ms. Hartman informed Ms. Crane that the trashcans are raccoon-proof.

Explaining that neighbors have expressed concern with this issue, Ms. Crane questioned bucket seat swings for toddlers, and Ms. Hartman indicated this feature in the illustration.

On question, Ms. Hartman informed Ms. Cannon that racks would be provided for four to six bicycles.

On question, Ms. Hartman informed Mr. Edberg that no lighting is proposed for the project.

On question, Mr. Beighley informed Ms. Cannon that the nearby swimming pool is located on 185th Avenue.

On question, Ms. Hartman informed Mr. Beighley that this property had been acquired as surplus property through the Oregon State Department of Transportation (ODOT).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

JOSEPH LIPSCOMB, 15785 NW Overton Drive, Beaverton, OR 97006, noted that he lives directly across the street from this proposed park, adding that he is opposed to the condition of approval for the chain link fence. He expressed his opinion that the park would be better left natural. He referred to a Condition of Approval regarding sidewalks, expressing his opinion that this is not necessary and that it would be a sidewalk to nowhere. Emphasizing that other than these

two issues he is very pleased with the proposal, he offered to respond to any questions.

Ms. Cannon questioned his opposition to the fence, and Mr. Lipscomb clarified that while he would prefer no fence, he particular opposes the proposed vinyl slats within the fence.

Mr. Osterberg explained that the City is not requiring this particular fence, only suggesting that it be dark brown, and the City is not requiring the slats, adding that their recommendation only specifies a chain link fence that is dark in color, which could easily be black, rather than brown.

Ms. Cannon clarified that this particular fence is chain link coated and does not specify slats.

Mr. Lipscomb acknowledged that he was mistaken about the slats, emphasizing that he favors open spaces and is still opposed to any fence, which is not necessary in that neighborhood. He noted that while he does not live in the City of Beaverton, the proposed park is directly across the street from the several acres that he owns.

Ms. Cannon requested clarification regarding the traffic situation in the area, and Mr. Lipscomb explained that access to Bronson Road is one way in and one way out, adding that if you don't live there, you don't get there. He noted that while Bronson Road probably only serves 35 homes, although there are 88 homes in Skyview and 25 or 30 homes in White Fox, adding that both of these areas serve off of Bronson Road as well. He explained that 35 or 40 years ago, Bronson Road had been the old highway, adding that the only access at that time had been Bronson Road and Cornell Road. Mr. Beighley observed that the area is not like it used to be at all, and Mr. Lipscomb agreed that Bronson Road is an isolated, leftover street from the past.

Observing that she had been in the area, Ms. Cannon expressed her concern that more speeding tickets are issued in people's own neighborhood, adding that she is thinking about the children in the street.

Mr. Lipscomb repeated his desire to keep the area open and natural, without this fence, and also eliminating the sidewalk, which he referred to as a "sidewalk with no place to go place".

On question, Ms. Hartman informed Mr. Beighley that while some individuals prefer the fence, her personal preference is no fence, adding that the staff had encouraged the addition of the fence.

Mr. Osterberg referred to page 5 of 12 in the Facilities Review Comments, specifically that "An existing chain link fence is located on the western property

lines of the site”, “A six-foot vinyl coated chain link fence is proposed”, and “the intention of the fence is to protect children from inadvertently running into the streets”, adding that this may not create a problem on the side with the slope. He noted further that “The applicant shall revise the plans to distinguish where the existing fence is located from the proposed fence.”

Chairman Williams described the current fence as being located at the top of the slope at the west side as well as at the bottom of this slope at the west side.

Mr. Osterberg pointed out that while there are existing fences, this proposal would not be introducing a new element to the area, adding that the Board of Design Review has the authority make revisions. He referred to the situation with the sidewalk, observing that this is how many projects are completed. As new developments come in, they bring with them frontage improvements, sidewalks, dedicated rights of way and street improvements, and over time there are enough improvements to link together. He added that this ultimately reduces the costs to local government when they decide to install sidewalks, as some portions have already been completed. He commented that staff does not recommend the deletion of this sidewalk, which will eventually provide the desired connections, and offered to respond to any final questions.

Ms. Cannon discussed Mr. Lipscomb’s observation that this is a sidewalk to nowhere and questioned whether this sidewalk will eventually connect to something. Mr. Osterberg assured her that along Bronson Road exists the potential for further sidewalks, future development of other properties, and possible city or county projects. On question, he informed Ms. Cannon that he has not personally been at the site, and she observed that while she has not been there either, this proposed sidewalk does appear to go nowhere.

Mr. Osterberg commented that staff remains in support of sidewalk frontage improvements.

The public testimony portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Lemon reminded other Boardmembers that while he has no objection to the elimination of the sidewalk or the fence, they are again dealing with the Facilities Review Committee, emphasizing that technically, they are not allowed to modify conditions imposed by this board.

Chairman Williams mentioned that he is in favor of leaving the sidewalk in but possibly conditioning the fence.

Ms. Cannon stated that she is in support of eliminating both the fence and the sidewalk.

Chairman Williams described possible modifications to the proposed sidewalk.

Mr. Lemon clarified that the basic intent is to fence the east and west side of the property and delete the fence on the north side, and Chairman Williams corrected him, adding that the fence is being deleted on the east side. Ms. Crane was assured that certain areas would be fenced to provide protection for children.

Mr. Lemon **MOVED** and Ms. Crane **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 2000-0019 – Skyview Park, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated April 27, 2000, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 14, with modifications and additional conditions, as follows:

15. Two (2) of the swing seats will have a full bucket seat system.
16. The trashcans will be constructed in such a manner as to prevent access by animals.
17. The chain link fencing along the east side of the park (the fencing on Bronson Road) will be deleted from the project.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

Ms. Cannon discussed offensive letters she had received from some members of the public opposed the Lynann Park Subdivision regarding a Public Hearing held April 13, 2000. Mr. Beighley informed her that eight of the eleven units had been approved, adding that he agrees that some of these letters were offensive. Mr. Osterberg briefed the Board on the status of the Lynann Park Subdivision and wording on the land use order.

The meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m..

CALENDAR

May	25	6:30 p.m.	Public Hearing	BDR 2000-0004	HAGGEN STORE
			Public Hearing	BDR 2000-0005	SEXTON PLACE TOWNHOMES
July	27	6:30 p.m.	Public Hearing	BDR 99-00231	HOME DEPOT (cont. from April 27, 2000)
			Public Hearing	VAR 99-00030	HOME DEPOT (cont from April 27, 2000)
			Public Hearing	VAR 99-00031	HOME DEPOT (cont from April, 27, 2000)